

**BALTIMORE CITY DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING**  
**URBAN DESIGN AND ARCHITECTURE REVIEW PANEL**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

**Date:** March 11, 2015

**Meeting No.:** 200

---

**Project:** Barclay – Old Goucher Phase II – The Park

**Phase:** Schematic

**Location:** East 20<sup>th</sup> Street and Barclay Street, Guilford Avenue

---

**PRESENTATION:**

Ms. Catherine Stokes (Telesis Baltimore) introduced the project which had been presented to the Panel in May 2014, however, this review is for the public park that forms a significant portion of the residential development proposed for East 20<sup>th</sup> and Barclay Street corner. Supported by Ms. Sarah Bowley (Marks Thomas Architects), Mr. Kevin Wegner (Oehme Van Sweden Landscape Architects) presented the concept and inspiration for the corner park which fronts market-rate residential townhome development. Note: The Panel was asked to focus on the architecture only as it relates to the park, not the backside of the housing.

Inspired by the characteristics of a variety of Baltimore parks, large and small, the proposal is an intimate space of 20,000 sq. ft. entered at the four corners (one corner being between the row homes) and bordered along the street edges with herbaceous planting and trees. The elliptically-shaped pin-cushion central lawn panel also contains herbaceous planting along its edge, trees, and fixed seating and places to gather at the northwest and southeast corners. The park is separated from the adjacent private homes by low fencing and floriferous, “low-maintenance” plantings. There is a component of stormwater management to the park, as well.

**RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PANEL:**

The discussion largely hinged around the nature of public vs. private as it relates to both the representation of the architecture (acknowledged by Ms. Bowley as in-process), and how that architecture relates to the public open space. During the course of the presentation, the Panel learned that the park is intended to be cared for by Baltimore City Recreation and Park with some homeowner responsibility for the maintenance of the stormwater portions, and concern for the integrity of the proposed design, in the long run, was verbalized. It was, however, generally acknowledged that the plan is handsome and the prospect of the development good. It will be a great addition to the neighborhood if rendered well.

Site and Building:

- How public space and private space is differentiated will greatly inform the success or failure of the effort. Rather than subject Baltimore City to the prospect of caring for the “verge” which is proposed as a multi-species, floriferous edge, please consider making

that interface between public and private (and the element that hides fencing which denotes property edge) a simple hedge that can remain verdant throughout the year AND be neatly and easily trimmed by a challenged workforce. Keeping that datum constant and well-maintained will assist in the perceived upkeep and value of the proposed development.

- Consider editing the central green, so that an elegant simplicity is achieved (and again, ease of maintenance is achieved). Remove some of the herbaceous material from the lawn area (it was noted by the developer that the park is not intended to be an active play park). And consider reducing the intrusion of the walking path on the northwest side. Rather, place the bench on the tracery of the ellipse, so that it deflects people to walk to the left or right as they approach the park from the northwest.
- Consider removing or reducing in quantity or size the trees within the lawn panel that are directly in front of “The Manor House” element. If this architectural expression is important to the composition, let it be seen.
- The Panel requests an exploration by the developer about the extent to which home owners will be allowed to individualize their dwellings, noting that the “fronts” represent a level of uniformity that is denied in the rear façade of the homes. How will color or other details inform both the front and the back?
- The success of the architecture will be in the quality and character of the details, in particular the porches and other semi-public interfaces.
- The back alleys need to be developed for future review by the Panel.

**PANEL ACTION:** The Panel recommends approval of the schematic design with the above comments.

**Attending:**

Catherine Stokes, Jenny Hope – Telesis  
Kevin Wagner - Oehme Van Sweden Landscape Architects  
Magda Westerhout, Sarah Bowley – Marks Thomas Architects  
Kevin Anderson – KCW Engineering Technologies  
Nicole Battle - Housing

Messrs. Bowden\*, and Rubin - UDARP Panel  
Director Tom Stosur, Christina Gaymon, Anthony Cataldo, Christina Gaymon, Reni Lewal,  
Aaron Bond